

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter that Applicant regards as the invention.

Reconsideration of the subject patent application in view of the present remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 5 are amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-5 and 7-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tagawa et al. (US 2002/004538; hereinafter "Tagawa") in view of Dean et al (6,771,323; hereinafter "Dean").

Regarding the amended claims 1 and 5, neither Tagawa nor Dean, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches or renders foreseeable that the reproducing procedures define a change of the superposition of the output of the reproducing unit and the output of the informing unit in time series. Support for the amendment is provided in the paragraphs [0017] and [0019] of the specification.

There is no disclosure in Tagawa that the reproduction modes disclosed in Tagawa define a change of the superposition of the output of the reproducing unit and the output of the informing unit in time series.

The Examiner alleged that Dean discusses metadata for defining the output function, therefore choosing the reproducing procedure. However, Dean's output function is defined by the metadata which includes, for example, color, luminance, and brightness information. Such Dean's output function does not defines a change of the superposition of the output of the reproducing unit and the output of the informing unit in time series recited in the amended claims. That means, Dean's reproducing procedure derived from the output function is completely different from the amended "reproducing procedure" recited in the amended claims.

Accordingly, the combination of Tagawa and Dean does not meet all of the limitations of claim 1 or 5. Therefore, the asserted combination of Tagawa and Dean does not render claims 1 and 5 obvious. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection as it applies to claims 1 and 5 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-4 and 9-10 which are dependent from claim 1 should also be allowable for at least the same reason.

Claims 7-8 and 11-12 which are dependent from claim 5 should also be allowable for at least the same reason.

In addition, regarding claims 9 and 11, neither Tagawa nor Dean, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches or renders foreseeable that the meta information contains type of the contents being reproduced. Tagawa does not disclose the above feature, since Tagawa fails to disclose the reproducing procedure is selected based on meta information extracted from contents as admitted by the Examiner in the Office action. The Office action states that Dean teaches the reproducing procedure is selected based on meta information extracted from the

contents, since Dean discusses metadata for defining the output function. However, the metadata 93 disclosed in Dean does not contain type of the contents being reproduced, but merely may include color, luminance, and brightness information (Dean; column 4, lines 32-34). There is no disclosure in Dean that the metadata 93 contains type of the contents being reproduced. Therefore, claims 9 and 11 should be allowable, regardless of the allowability of claims 1 and 5.


In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

Appl. No. 10/599,000
Amdt. Dated: June 18, 2009
Reply to Office action of March 18, 2009

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No.: NGB-41245.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: 
Nobuhiko Sukenaga, Reg. No. 39446

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: June 18, 2009